

Vietnam, Ron Laney worked his way through college as a juvenile probation counselor, earning a degree in criminology and a masters in criminal justice. Mr. Laney soon found his calling in policy development at the Federal Government's Law Enforcement Assistance Agency, LEAA. Continuing his career in public service, he joined the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention, OJJDP, as a law enforcement program manager. Mr. Laney quickly made his presence known developing OJJDP's first law enforcement training program entitled Police Operations Leading to Improved Children and Youth Services, POLICY.

Mr. Laney continued to develop new and dynamic programs for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, including Child Abuse and Exploitation Investigative Techniques, CAE; Managing Juvenile Operations, Gang Investigations, and Gang and Drug Policy; and School Administrator for Effective-Policy, SAFE-Policy, which is one of the first comprehensive interagency efforts to improve school and community safety. For approximately 10 years, Ron trained over 96,000 participants including law enforcement, legal professionals, social service personnel, as well as medical and other child protection and enforcement professionals.

In 1998, Congress appropriated funding to combat child exploitation through the internet. Mr. Laney seized upon this opportunity to create a national prototype program, called the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, ICAC. Initially, the ICAC Program consisted of 10 regional task forces made up of local, State, and Federal agencies all working together to provide expertise to investigate child sexual exploitation via the internet. The ICAC Task Force now also provides community outreach programs to teach children and parents of the dangers of internet usage, and has expanded to include 46 regional task forces, with over 500 local, state, and federal law enforcement officers covering all areas of the United States. Since ICAC's creation, investigations of sexual victimization of children involving the use of internet technology have spanned the globe and have sparked the training of other foreign governments on ICAC techniques. The ICAC programs have come to represent the most comprehensive effort to recognize, investigate, and prosecute adult child sex offenders using internet technology.

In addition to working to create the ICAC, Mr. Laney contributed to the development of the Amber Alert program, advocated for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and provided policy and funding assistance for the American Prosecutors' research institute. Throughout his exemplary civil service career, Mr. Laney has provided outstanding leadership, advice, and sound professional judgment to his colleagues. Mr. Laney's commitment to child protection for over 30 years is evidenced by the training of over 500,000 child protection specialists from multiple disciplines. Additionally, he has provided training to educators and school administrators impacting the safety of over 750,000 K-12 students. Mr. Laney's legacy to our society is the protection of our children and advocacy for abused children and their parents.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I call upon my colleagues to join me in applauding his past accomplishments and wishing him the best of luck in all future endeavors.

## HONORING MIKE JUNE

### HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, July 24, 2006*

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mike June, a man of tremendous courage and spirit who recently passed away.

Michael John June was many things to many people. He was a son. He was a husband. He was a father. He was a brother. He was a friend. All who knew and loved him will tell you that he was as kind-hearted, generous, and unselfish an individual as there ever was.

Mike also was a constituent of mine, and a hard-nosed football coach at Palm Harbor University High School, near my congressional district. Mike was always determined and focused on winning, though he cared deeply for his players and wore his emotions on his sleeve. He sometimes cried, after both wins and losses, but often displayed the trademark smile that lurked just below his handlebar mustache, especially when his players performed as he knew they could.

Mike also had an ebullient personality and can-do attitude. He was diagnosed with leukemia in November 2002, yet was coaching his boys the following season. His best friend and former college roommate observed that, "it seemed like there was nothing that could get him down." Mike kept coaching and teaching, even when his cancer returned and his doctors told him that he was risking death by doing so. He did so because, as one of his former players has commented, "he loved to give what he had."

Those who cared for Mike in his final days have said that, despite his serious illness, he did not pity himself or lament the hand he had been dealt. In fact, when asked how he was doing, he always replied "excellent."

Mr. Speaker, Mike June loved his wife Paula, and his children Mike, Max, Matthew, Mitchell, and Mia. I hope the sadness that they and those who cared about him feel at his passing will one day be eclipsed by the joy of knowing that his legacy will live on in those who were fortunate enough to have known him. May God bless his soul and may He watch over his family.

FANNIE LOU HAMER, ROSA PARKS, AND CORETTA SCOTT KING VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

### HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 13, 2006*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965:

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, on July 13, I reluctantly voted against H.R. 9, a bill that significantly altered the Voting Rights Act (VRA). Contrary to popular opinion, H.R. 9 did not represent a time-critical reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act. The VRA, which pro-

hibits voter discrimination, is permanent Federal law. It never needs reauthorization. However, certain provisions of the Act (Sections 6-9 and Section 203), which were meant to be temporary and periodically reviewed by Congress, are due to expire a year from now—not today, this month or even this year.

When enacted in 1965, the Voting Rights Act played a critical role in granting equal rights to all Americans to cast their ballots. At that point in our Nation's history, some jurisdictions used extraordinary voter suppression devices like poll taxes and literacy tests that were designed to discriminate against minority voters and indeed had that effect. Congress rightly responded in kind with extraordinary remedies that were deemed emergency provisions. The emergency or temporary provisions of the VRA include Section 5, which requires certain covered jurisdictions to pre-clear any change in their election laws or procedures with the Department of Justice. This means relocating a ballot booth in one neighborhood can require Federal approval. It also includes Section 203, added in 1975, mandating that ballots in certain jurisdictions be provided in languages other than English.

Unfortunately, H.R. 9 is significantly flawed. For example, H.R. 9 does not simply reauthorize Section 5 of VRA but makes significant changes to the section. Specifically, it requires that for Section 5 pre-clearance that minorities as a group, not as individuals, be allowed to elect their preferred candidate of choice. Legal scholars disagree on the meaning of this phrase but many interpret it to mean that states will now be forced in decennial Congressional redistricting to maximize the number of districts where a certain political party wins. For example, in the recent Texas redistricting case it was found that if most members of a minority group vote Democratic, they are entitled to a district that elects a Democrat. If a minority candidate wins the district, that is not sufficient. It must be a Democrat minority candidate. That is not a voting right; it is a voting wrong. No less a legal authority than former Solicitor General Ted Olson has stated the following:

"For forty-one years, the Voting Rights Act has focused on protecting voters' rights to cast a ballot by forbidding States from adopting laws that 'abridge[] the right to vote on account of race or color.' The new version of the Voting Rights Act, however, risks shifting the Act's focus to protect politicians' interests in holding office, by entrenching preferred candidates of choice. I believe that most Americans would agree that the Voting Rights Act should be used to protect voters' access to the ballot box, not to protect incumbents' reelection chances."

Thus, Section 5 should be reauthorized as is without this new language.

Another flaw of H.R. 9 is that it preserves 40-year-old criteria (based on the 1964, '68, and '72 presidential elections) to determine which states and counties are subject to provisions of the VRA. But minority-voting patterns are now dramatically different than they were 40 years ago. For example, today in Georgia, blacks are more likely than whites to register to vote and to exercise their right to vote. The VRA should be used to protect voting rights everywhere, not just the South and a handful of other counties. Discrimination today can happen just as easily in Michigan or New Jersey as it can in Texas or Georgia. Unless this